REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is requiring restriction to one of the following groups:

Group I: Claim 1, drawn to a metallocene complex.

Group II: Claims 2-4, drawn to a catalyst composition.

Group III: Claim 5, drawn to a polymerization process.

Group IV: Claim 6, drawn to an olefin polymer.

The Examiner is also requiring the election of a single cocatalyst species, i.e.,

cocatalyst (B), apparently from those disclosed in Claim 4.

Applicants provisionally elect Group I, Claim 1, drawn to a metallocene complex,

with traverse on the grounds that no adequate reasons and/or examples have been provided to

support a conclusion of patentable distinctiveness between the identified groups. Also, it has

not been shown that a burden exists in searching the claims of the four groups.

Moreover, the M.P.E.P. at §803 states as follows:

> If the search and examination of an entire application can be
> made without a serious burden, the Examiner must examine it
> on its merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or
> independent inventions.

Applicants respectfully submit that a search of all of the claims would not impose a

serious burden on the Office.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that, because elected Claim 1 does not include

a cocatalyst (B) component, an election of species should not be necessary or required.

Accordingly, and for the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that the Office

has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the Restriction Requirement.

Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in

condition for examination on the merits, and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

James H. Knebel
Registration No. 22,630

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/07)